

Movements of Organizations.

From Evangelical Christendom.

THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE AND THE SABBATH.

A Prize of One Hundred Pounds is offered by the Council for an Essay on the Sabbath, to be written *with a special view to circulation among the higher classes of the community*. The Essay will be expected to bring into view—the theories which have prevailed in regard to the Sabbath—the scriptural authority and obligation of the Sabbath—the history and advantages of the Sabbath—the present *actual* extent of Sabbath desecration in our own and other countries—the extent of such desecration, as *compared* with what it has been—the causes to which it is attributable, and the moral means by which it may be counteracted. It is not intended to limit writers to these topics. They merely show the kind of work which the Council desiderate. It is wished that the whole subject of the Sabbath may be clearly and fully dealt with. The work must be sound in argument—strictly correct in facts and statistics—powerful in its appeals, and, of course, free from sectarian and political bias; and must not exceed a moderate-sized octavo volume. Competitors to send in their MSS. for adjudication, not later than the 1st of October, 1855, addressed to the Secretaries of the Evangelical Alliance, 7, Adam-street, Strand, London, to whom all communications on the subject of the Essay are likewise to be addressed. Each MS. to have a motto inscribed on it, and to be accompanied with a sealed letter having the same motto, and enclosing the name and address of the writer. The first edition of the successful Essay, to the extent of not more than 2000 copies, to be the property of the Council. The Rev. Dr. HARPER, Professor of Divinity in the United Presbyterian Church, the Rev. JOHN JORDAN, Vicar of Enstone, and the Rev. Dr. STOWELL, President of Cheshunt College, have consented to act as Adjudicators—by whose award the Council will be bound, *on the distinct understanding that the Essay selected as the best shall also be deemed by them to be worthy of the subject, and of the cause designed to be promoted.*

From the Northern Standard.

ANTI-PATRONAGE MOVEMENT IN THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

At the meeting of the Presbytery of Glasgow, Dr. Gillan introduced his motion, of which he had previously given notice, to the effect that the Presbytery overture, the General Assembly to memorialise Government to modify the law of patronage. He adverted to the fact, that he had been warned, in the event of proceeding with this motion, he might expect to meet with powerful opposition, but to his mind, there was urgent necessity for bringing it forward; and it was because of the respect he held for the Church of Scotland, and deeply solicitous for her improvement, that he had ventured to bring forward his motion. He asked for a modification of the law, not that he objected to its repeal, but he had no hopes of at present obtaining it. If that was accomplished, they would only have returned to the constitution of the Established Church at the Reformation. Dr. Gillan proceeded at great length to recite the history of the act, and contended that the passing of it was an infringement of the Treaty of the Union, and that the patrons, when it was for a season abolished, had received ample compensation, which they did not refund when the law was re-enacted. He paid a high

compliment to the patrons who consulted the feelings and judgment of the people, by allowing them a lect of candidates, and it was some such arrangement he desired as would make that which had been nobly granted by many binding upon all. The present he looked upon as the favourable time for accomplishing the desired end. Patrons, from the Queen to the town Council, were disposed to act in a liberal spirit, and the Government, he was credibly informed, were also disposed to entertain some such measure. By effecting a modification of the law of patronage, he anticipated the return of many who had seceded from the ranks of the Establishment, and ere long the Church of Scotland would be the church of the majority instead of the minority of the people. Dr. Gillan concluded a long and eloquent speech by submitting his motion.

Mr. McLean seconded the motion, and supported it in terms similar to those of the mover.

Dr. McLeod was not aware that there had been any correspondence with the Government on the subject, but he would like to know what reason there was to suppose that the aristocracy wished to give up patronage, or that Lord Aberdeen was favorable to the proposed measure.

Mr. Brown said the motion seemed to him to be quite uncalled for, and moved as an amendment, that it is inexpedient.

Dr. Smith seconded the amendment.

Mr. McLaws, elder, assured the Presbytery that this was a question which was exciting much of the attention of the laity, and he felt it his duty to support Dr. Gillan's motion.

Dr. Gilian, in reference to Dr. McLeod's remark, said, he understood that at the sitting of last Assembly, a certain minister had correspondence with members of Government on this subject, who had expressed themselves favorable to a modification of the law.

Dr. Hill thought they should be in possession of some more definite information as to the intentions of Government before they took any steps. The church was not at present suffering anything like distress; great and important duties were before her, which imperatively demanded the attention of her ministers; and he very much deprecated the setting up of a crusade of this description, so much calculated to promote discord. As for uniting Voluntaries and other Dissenters by the passing of such a measure, the idea appeared to him to be groundless.

Dr. Barr would prefer that the question of patronage were not made the subject of discussion at the present. They had now for a number of years, been in the enjoyment of harmony, and calm, quiet refreshing, and he was strongly under the impression that the introduction of any topic, such as this would interfere with that calm. At the same time, if Dr. Gillan pressed his motion, he (Dr. Barr) must conscientiously support it.

Dr. Napier and Dr. Craik opposed the motion, and Mr. Park supported it.

Dr. Gillan having replied, it was agreed to take the vote, when there appeared,

For the motion, 8; for the amendment, 38.

Only three elders supported the original motion.

Gentility consists not in birth, wealth, manners or fashion, but in a high sense of honour, and a determination to do what is right, to the best of our ability, under all circumstances—that is “to do justice, to love mercy, and walk humbly before God.”